(6)

L.F 100 Rs

BEFORE THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR

CHHATTISGARH.

W.P.NO. 1942 /2001.

PETITIONER. Bal Mukund Loniya, son of Dular Singh Ex-Shiksha Karmi of village Ghameri, Gram Panchayat Boiraha, Janpad Panchayat Lormi, Distt. Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh. resident of village Nawrangpur, Post Ramhepur Via Lormi, Distt. Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

Versus.

RESPONDENTS.

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Deptt. of Panchayat and Social Welfare at Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. The Janpad Panchayat through Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Lormi, Distt. Bilaspur, C.G.
3. The Gram Panchayat, Boiraha, Through the Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat, Boiraha, Distt. Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

P.R. No. 1686/17
Presented by Shri D.P. Pathela
dated 9.5.18

PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF A WRIT OF APPROPRIATE NATURE OR DIRECTION OR ORDER

XI-HC-22

(84)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

**आदेश पत्रक**

**मामला क्रमांक** WP-1948/01 **सन्** 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

| आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित | आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित | कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश |
|---|---|---|

**19.9.2006**

Shri Sanjay Patel, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Satish Gupta, Dy.Govt. Advocate for the State/ respondent no.1.

Shri Sandeep Dubey, counsel for respondent nos. 2 & 3.

Arguments heard.

Order dictated as follows:

**ORAL ORDER**

The petitioner who was appointed as Guruji under Shiksha Guarantee Yojna has challenged the legality of his termination order dated 01.12.1999 which has been filed as page No.8 of the petition. A perusal of the impugned order would show that on account of certain irregularities in appointments, the appointment of the petitioner has been cancelled.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was appointed as ***Guruji*** in Centre Ghameri, Gram Panchayat Boiraha. He submits that the appointment of the petitioner has been subsequently cancelled because the petitioner belongs to village Nawrangpur which is at a distance of 45 Kms. from village Ghameri. The submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the order of termination/cancellation is illegal.

During the course of arguments, learned counsel submits that for the present, this petition may be disposed of and the petitioner may be given an opportunity to file a detailed representation before the competent authority of the respondents

29/9/06

XI-HC-22

85

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

**आदेश पत्रक**

**मामला क्रमांक** WP-1942/21 **सन्** **200**

..... विरुद्ध .....

| आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित | आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित -2- | कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश |
|---|---|---|

and the competent authority may be directed to decide the representation in accordance with law. This limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner is not opposed by the learned counsel for the State as also learned counsel for respondents no.2 and 3.

This limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner is allowed.

It is directed that if so advised, the petitioner may file a detailed representation alongwith a copy of the writ petition before the competent authority within a period of 21 days from today accompanied by a copy of the order passed by this Court and if such a representation is filed, the competent authority shall try to dispose of the same as early as possible preferably within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of representation.

With the aforesaid observations, this petition stands finally disposed of.

C.C. as per rules.

**Sd/-**
**Sunil Kumar Sinha**
**Judge**

Rao

(पीछे देखिये)